Chapter Twelve

Organizing to Combat 21st Century Terrorism

Douglas Menarchik

"Generally, management of the many is the same as management of the few. It is a matter of organization."

Sun Tzu, 400-320 B.C.

"Woe to the government, which, relying on half-hearted politics and a shackled military policy, meets a foe who, like the untamed elements, knows no law other than his own power!"

Clausewitz, *On War*

Introduction

Some scholars may argue organizational structures do not much affect the quality of combating terrorism (CT) decision and policy making. Others, however, argue organizational arrangements do matter, and that scholars should pay attention to the organizational design US Presidents have used. Leadership also plays a central role in ensuring effective policy. Both organization and leadership are critical. Good leadership can overcome poor organizational arrangements, but good organization can seldom overcome poor leadership.

Many scholars date the beginning of modern international terrorism with the multiple hijackings by Palestinian terrorists in the Middle East in 1968-69. At the close of the 20th century, terrorism appears as a ubiquitous theme in American national security documents. Six US administrations of both parties experimented with CT structures and evolved policies that built upon each other, or, at other times, replaced each other. Each administration coped with terrorism somewhat differently—by placing its individual stamp on policy and dealing with the terrorism problem as it existed at the time. Each new administration perched atop a developing terrorism bureaucracy that debated the key issues that shaped that terrorism phenomenon. They debated

what priority to give terrorism, whether terrorism was a lesser or greater threat, a criminal or military threat. Some saw terrorism as a threat unto itself; others saw it as an aberrant, violent part of a larger socio-politico-diplomatic problem. Terrorism as a policy issue slowly became part of the bureaucratic landscape.

Terrorism now has become a permanent feature of US national security policy. America has a small fiefdom of subject matter experts, policy and intelligence analysts, and operators all working within discrete organizations dedicated to deal with it. The US now has had over three decades of experience in combating modern international terrorism. The US has experienced a variety of forms of terrorism, extending over a sustained time with varying intensities. This experience provides a body of data and knowledge that scholars can use to make judgments on which structures and policies are more effective and efficient than are others.

This paper will argue that America's experience shows terrorism in the 21st century will continue to warrant a relatively low priority. Despite the recent concern in the US to prepare for "consequence management" of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons of mass destruction (NBC WMD), the US should continue to focus on dealing with high volume, low-technology terrorism that the US experienced over the past 30 years. US senior leadership should be knowledgeable about terrorism, and involved in high-level policy. All elements of the terrorism community need to be educated and trained in the nuts and bolts of combating terrorism—interagency and international coordination remains the weak link. Within the US terrorism bureaucracy, "stovepiping" (dealing with terrorism problems from the perspective of an agency's narrow viewpoint) must be overcome so that all levels of government interact, coordinate, and deal more effectively with the terrorism problem from the federal, state, and local levels. Currently, state and local interest in terrorism is negligible.

The central focus of this paper is the combating terrorism structure. The agencies must better interconnect, from the national command authority

(NCA, meaning the President and the Defense Secretary, who authorize use of military force), through the cabinet and senior terrorism bureaucracy experts, down to the crisis and consequence management units that deal with terrorist incidents.

Key Issues of the Debate on Terrorism

Terrorism's Nature and Threat

Many believe terrorism is a permanent fixture in international politics, but the terrorist threat has been episodic. Levels of international terrorism ranged from less than 200 incidents per year in the 1970s to 666 incidents per year in the 1980s when major Middle Eastern terrorism campaigns rocked US interests world-wide. Terrorism proved to be a global phenomenon, affecting every region. Some regions absorbed higher levels than others (Western Europe, Middle East, South America). Terrorists appeared as individuals, in sub- and transnational groups, and some were state sponsored. The vast majority was low-technology, but the threat of "super" terrorism (terrorism involving nuclear, chemical, or biological (NBC) weapons of mass destruction (WMD)), remained a nagging concern of even the most conservative CT analysts.

Empirical data seemed to support the notion that modern terrorism would decline as a peace dividend of the Cold War's end. Many believed post-Cold War terrorism would stay in a smaller box, and not vary much from what had occurred over the preceding thirty years. Indeed, the US Department of State's data showed international terrorism declined dramatically after 1989 with the collapse of international communism, and the fall of the Soviet Union. High levels of international terrorism returned in 1991, but these incidents were linked to the Gulf War. One of the largest single-year decreases in the number of international terrorist incidents occurred in 1992, as attacks declined to 391. During 1997, there were 304 acts of international terrorism worldwide, an increase of eight from 1996. Over one-third of the attacks occurred in Colombia (90 were low-level pipeline bombings.) The 1997 attacks killed 221 persons and wounded 693 others, as compared to 314

killed and 2,912 wounded in 1996. Of these, seven US citizens were killed and 21 wounded in 1997, down from 23 killed and 510 wounded in 1996. Latin America sustained the highest numbers of incidents with 128, followed by Europe with 52, Eurasia with 42, and the Middle East with 37. The most lethal region overall was the Middle East with 375 killed and 105 wounded, followed by Asia with 271 killed and 73 wounded. Businesses remained the most likely targets (about 75% of the total), and bombing the most likely attack method (175/304 events). In the past twenty years, international terrorist incidents ranged between 434 (1979) to 666 in 1987, dropped precipitously in 1989 to 375, peaked in 1991 to 565 during the Gulf War and dropped to a low of 296 in 1996.[1]

The US was a prime target of international terrorism. The US sustained 25-40% of the blows (Israel at times sustained higher numbers of attacks). Former Secretary of State George Shultz believed America's terrorism problem was "99% overseas." Sub-national and transnational groups were home grown and supported by the Soviets or other state sponsors. Middle East terrorism proved to be especially enduring, sometimes spectacular, virulent, and anti-US. Some believed the Middle East was an engine for international terrorism, and that if the Middle East disputes were resolved, international terrorism would go away.

Are terrorists imitators or innovators, rapidly adaptable or conservative planners? Does the post-Cold War era have a "new" terrorism? Is "super" terrorism a real concern? Terrorists do what works best for them. They stay with tried and tested tactics, weapons, and targets. They have, by and large, used five types of actions (bombing, assaults, kidnappings, hijackings, assassinations, all punishable crimes). Targets in open societies are plentiful. Simple weapons they use tend to achieve their goals. Simple tactics work. Terrorists have proven themselves to be conservative planners. They have little incentive to change. Mass casualties have not been a specific goal of most terrorists. Brian Jenkins, America's first terrorism superstar scholar, often says that terrorists want a lot of people watching, not a lot of

people dead.[2] He argues against the trend toward super terrorism and terrorists' use of weapons of mass destruction. Indiscriminate terrorism occasionally resulting in a large number of casualties is not equal to mass terrorism.

In the 1990's, international terrorism declined dramatically, but it became more diverse and ambiguous. For example, progress in the Middle East peace process simply spawned a new set of terrorist players. Other new actors appeared without roots in the established disputes. The post-Cold War world introduced a new strategic environment with proliferation of technology, lucrative targets and openness of more market democracies, and weapons of mass destruction aplenty. Would the post-Cold War era also produce a "new" terrorism—"amateur" terrorists operating on their own or in small, autonomous groups who carried out unsophisticated but very deadly attacks, using home-made weapons, tactics, techniques, and weapons-making knowledge learned from the Internet? Will the 21st century see "super" terrorism (WMD) emerge?

Terrorism's Priority Compared to Other US Security Interests

Terrorism's priority has vacillated between word and deed. The US has often talked about making terrorism a high priority, but has actually failed to do so. Several Administrations had "declared" terrorism a high priority. They often made loud rhetorical statements against terrorism, but had neither the political will, resources, nor policy instruments to back up the rhetoric. Terrorism butted heads with other regional or functional priorities. The Reagan Administration wanted to do more with a proactive policy, but did not, or perhaps could not. The Middle East peace process had a higher priority than punishing terrorists in the region. The situation complicated the decisions to determine which terrorists to attack, and where and how to attack them. The Bush Administration seemed to lessen the priority of terrorism since the threat had significantly lowered in the early 1990's after the collapse of the Soviet Union and resolution of some of the Cold War's toughest, intractable disputes.

With a recent resurgence in terrorism, the Clinton Administration placed a higher priority on homeland defense and international terrorism in its written security documents. Clinton's policy, however, was not proactive nor backed up with sustained resources and action. The domestic threat has remained relatively low, but recent actions by home-grown terrorists (Oklahoma City), and some imported terrorism (New York Twin Towers), raised questions about the future of homeland defense. The proliferation of technology and WMD, and "loose nukes," raised the interest in, and priority of, "super" terrorism.

Is Terrorism a Legal or Political Issue?

Two questions define this argument. Does terrorism have an irreducible political belief system of its members? Does terrorism affect national security? If the answer to these questions is "yes," then terrorism is defined as a military and political issue. Terrorism from individuals, sub- and transnational groups can threaten important state interests. State sponsors can use terrorist groups to carry out their foreign policy through proxy wars. Military force may be needed to prevent, deter, pre-empt, disrupt, or respond to it.

If the answer to these questions is "no," then terrorism is a legal issue. "Due process" and law enforcement are the drivers for a juridical approach to CT. A terrorist who bombs a building is an arsonist; one who takes hostages is a kidnapper; one who assassinates political leaders is a murderer. Cause or motivation does not make terrorism legitimate by this understanding.

Can a state get international agreement on what constitutes that crime? Extraterritoriality, extending the long-arm of US laws overseas into other states' jurisdiction, remains thorny. Establishing FBI liaison offices overseas is an attempt at international cooperation among police forces. The working relationship between the Departments of Justice and State, and between the US and other states, remain complex.

Law enforcement seems to have won the debate by argument and default. Many Defense Department civilians and senior officers in the US

military's conventional forces did not embrace the issue. They accommodated terrorism within the framework of other higher priority security issues. The special operations community held terrorism as a tertiary responsibility.

The military, however, must remain involved in CT policy. In some special domestic cases of terrorism, and many overseas cases, a US military response may be the only response available. Americans need not be reminded that a decade after the 1988 Pan Am 103 bombing, the alleged terrorists remained free, and Libya had been punished only through an ever weakening international economic sanctions regime. Responding to overseas terrorism remains a requirement. Increasingly, the US is relying on stand-off weapons attacks with cruise missiles and precision-guided weapons air delivered. "Super" terrorism and homeland defense further muddy the water. How would law enforcement deal with these issues of strategic import, and what role does DoD play?

DoD is not a Lead Agency in terrorism, but has a primary supporting role in the national security aspects of CT. In 1986, Congress had mandated the US military become "joint." "Jointness" is solving the "stovepipe" problem by having Military Services working together for more integrated policy and operations. "Jointness" worked well for the military. The culture of the military Services began to go "purple." The Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force worked towards a more effective and efficient joint solution to security problems rather than throwing up "stovepipe" solutions that were rigidly Service-based. The next steps "beyond jointness" are interagency and international "jointness."

Departments and Agencies that perform different functions, that have different cultures, responsibilities, and have a particular way of doing business, but that work to combat terrorism, need to take that long step into "jointness." After interagency "jointness" is international cooperation. If dealing with international terrorism requires international cooperation, then nations must find a way to work together better.

The old saying, "one man's freedom fighter is another man's terrorist," still has resonance in some places in the world. Developing states, especially, chafe at the hint of intervention into their internal affairs. Often they see terrorists as freedom fighters who are using the only means available to fight against neo-colonialism, great power intervention, and local tyrants.

Some experts believe terrorism is a violent symptom of larger, intractable political issues. For example, some would say Palestinian terrorism resulted from the multi-faceted issues of the Israel-Palestinian dispute. Fixing the terrorism symptom meant first fixing the precipitating cause: Palestinian terrorism would cease once the Israel-Palestinian issue was resolved. Others, however, saw terrorism as a threat in itself, a form of warfare directed against US interests. Terrorism had its own dynamic, its own engine, its own nature, and required tools specifically designed to contain or kill it.

Some developing states view terrorists not as criminals but as freedom fighters, legitimate revolutionaries continuing the popular anti-colonial struggles of the 1950s. The developing world was tolerant of anti-Western violence, and applauded the anti-US, anti-Vietnam violence that racked US and Western cities. Some terrorist groups were media savvy. Western liberals and apologists stressed the terrorists' grievances. Some believed terrorism, as a phenomenon, could not be solved without first solving the "root causes" that spawned them. Western society remained confused about terrorism and its nature. Finding a consensus on a strategy to defeat it was elusive. Few Western leaders tackled the issue head on. Few knew what to do with this complex, multi-dimensional issue. These views still exist today, and hence, international consensus to defeat terrorism remains elusive.

Who's in Charge?

Terrorism touched upon many agencies, especially those involved with national security.[3] Real power in the US government still resides in executive departments that have people, equipment, money, and a capacity to get things done. These departments also tend to do business based on their "culture" and function in government. The military has a different "ethic, mind, and

profession" compared to that of a policeman, diplomat, intelligence officer, or political statesman. Getting them to work together to deal with complex, overlapping, and multidimensional issues is the rub. Many agencies scrambled to get a piece of the action and resources that came with it. Terrorism had a cachè and was a sexy subject. Key players were the State Department, DoD, CIA, NSC, Justice/FBI, Transportation/Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and some others. How to determine who was in charge became a hotly debated topic. Six US Administrations responded with a variety of organizational answers, some more effective and efficient than others. These models included a Cabinet Committee on Terrorism, or a high level Special Situation Group. The power center tended to reside at State or the NSC. Numerous interagency structures were imbedded into and over the existing bureaucracy. Lead Agencies managed terrorist incidents. (State was responsible for overseas terrorism issues; Justice/FBI responsible for domestic terrorism issues; and Transportation/FAA responsible for domestic hijackings. Lead Agency responsibilities are determined by location of the incident.)

The issues of the debate in terrorism were heady, and indeed, caused many headaches. Few issues were resolved fully. How six Administrations played out the issues of the debate follows. My purpose is not to write history, but to use the history to support these points:

--CT should have a relatively low priority

--Senior leadership needs to be trained, educated and involved in CT

--CT structures need to be interconnected from top to bottom with DoD as a Lead Agency. These structures need to be exercised fully with games and simulations to work out the bugs and to plan to deal with NBC/WMD.

--The US should consider preparing for strategic crime by thinking about an Office of Strategic Services-type organization.

Three Decades of CT Organizational Lessons Learned[4]

The issues of the debate played themselves out as six administrations attempted to resolve America's terrorism problem. Each Administration

advanced the debate and helped develop US combating terrorism policy, deliberate planning, and crisis response decision-making structures. The policy development path was not linear. One Administration would decide to use diplomatic and economic power instruments as the first line of defense. Later, another would decide to use force to battle terrorists and their sponsors directly. Full policy justification and on-the-shelf operational tools usually lagged behind response needs. America learned how to combat terrorism one incident at a time.

Nixon-Ford: "Setting up against Sub-national and Transnational Terrorism, Over There"

The Nixon Administration became aware of international terrorism after the 1968-69 multiple hijackings in the Middle East. In 1972, terrorists upped the ante with the Munich massacre of Israeli Olympic athletes. This dramatic event showed terrorism a crime of great political importance and effect. Now, terrorists were new actors on the international stage, a hybrid of criminal thuggery, political staging, and media spectacular. These combinations drew the public eye like a magnet.

Most experts then viewed the terrorism landscape as a collage of individual and sub-national groups operating independently within a state, or transnational actions operating across borders, some with support from sponsoring states. In the beginning, few saw the "invisible hand" of states using terrorists as an instrument of their foreign policy. But terrorism almost tripled in the 70s. Sheer volume of terrorist atrocities outraged citizens. They demanded governmental action. The Nixon-Ford Administrations viewed terrorism as a crime, an overseas problem of low priority, and a manifestation of larger political problems.

By the end of the 1970s, the basic elements of an international-oriented combating terrorism policy were established, using a mix of diplomatic, economic, and military power instruments. A traditional timing sequence developed. The CT clock began ticking with the terrorist incident. The CT reaction sequence started with diplomacy and dèmarches, followed by

economic sanctions and export/visa controls. US leaders considered a hostage rescue if negotiations failed, and, as a last resort, military force to retaliate.

At the organizational level, CT was a low-key, low-profile bureaucracy composed of "part-time" experts taken from other fields. Terrorism lacked priority and real interest among the top leaders. While structures were in place with high-sounding titles, the real bureaucracy operated at a Deputy Assistant Secretary level.

In general, the Nixon-Ford Administrations viewed terrorism as criminal activity conducted largely by sub-national and transnational terrorists. The US would not negotiate with criminals. America's declared policy was to not give in to terrorists' demands and to urge this policy on other states. The US believed that to give in to terrorists' demands would only further the terrorists' cause and invite further terrorism.

While the declared policy of "no concessions" weathered the strain of time, in actual practice, many governments in the 1970s negotiated the freeing of hostages on a regular basis, including the US. Later, the Nixon Administration began developing policy that called for the punishment of states that supported terrorists. The Nixon-Ford Administration emphasized the international dimension of international terrorism and used agreements and organizations to combat it, and increased protection of US facilities abroad. Diplomacy and anti-terrorism were primary tools to punish and thwart terrorists abroad.[5]

Nixon-Ford: High-level Cabinet Structure

Nixon established an intelligence committee on terrorism in 1972, shortly after the Olympics' Munich Massacre by Black September terrorists. The committee's purpose was to work with the international community to analyze the terrorist threat and to deter it. Key agencies were the CIA, FBI, and the State Department. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Near East/South Asia headed the committee. From this point on, the State Department would continue to play a central role in international terrorism.

Nixon also formed a Cabinet Committee on Terrorism (CCT) in 1972 consisting of State (Chairman), Defense, Treasury, Transportation, CIA, FBI, the Attorney General, the US UN Ambassador, the NSC Adviser, and the President's domestic affairs adviser. The Committee's purpose was to direct the fight against terrorism by having intelligence collected, providing physical protection, and evaluating CT programs in order to make recommendations.

The group had little real interest in the terrorism problem. They met only once, and had disbanded by 1977. Using the President's cabinet "buddies," political experts, and friends was helpful to direct the big picture, but the President was not square in the middle of terrorism policy leadership, a vital missing link. Despite the lofty level, terrorism did not have a high priority in the Administration. The CCT was not linked to the President, who is a necessary element for using force and setting the proper priority for terrorism. The CCT was to brief the President from "time-to-time." Since the CCT met only once, it accomplished nothing.

The concept of a President using his Cabinet to direct the fight against terrorism is reasonable only if the threat is deemed to be high enough and important enough to take the Cabinet's time. The terrorism threat did not reach that level in the 1970s until the Iran Hostage Crisis. The Cabinet-level committee certainly could have provided the political weight to government action, but individual members did not have the interest, and collectively, the group was too diverse, perhaps too large, to deal with the lower priority that terrorism had on the President's real agenda.

The CCT, however, was important in that it elevated the rhetorical or declared importance of terrorism to the penultimate level. Equally important was the bureaucratic level of a CCT Working Group chaired by a Special Assistant to the Secretary of State. He was the first national level coordinator for CT. His rank was Ambassador. This rank gave the Coordinator some bureaucratic clout within the terrorism community and a doorway to the Secretary of State. The position further established the central role for the

State Department with its focus on anti-US terrorism abroad, and international terrorism as the key threat.

The Coordinator, however, had a small staff (6), no real budget, and lacked rank to impose his will upon the other departments that participated. The group functioned well, meeting over 100 times during the Nixon-Ford years. As terrorism grew as an issue and expanded into other bureaus, the size of the working group doubled, from about ten members in the early 1970s to almost two dozen by the mid-to-late 1970s. The size of the group became too cumbersome, and therefore too difficult to focus for effective and efficient deliberate planning.[6]

Figure 1. The Nixon-Ford High-level Cabinet Model[7]

CCT

CCT Working Group (Intelligence Committee chaired by State)
Coordinator

Departments

Carter: "Solve the Larger Political Problem, Deal With and Contain Terrorist Incidents, and Terrorism Goes Away. Oops!"

Carter looked at the underlying causes of sub- and transnational terrorism, and saw unresolved international political issues as the cause. For example, the Palestinian problem, as a component of the Arab-Israeli dispute, had spawned numerous anti-Israel and anti-US groups. These groups were either based in Arab states, supported by them and operating from within their borders, or were transnational groups operating across international borders, some with state sponsorship.

Carter agreed economic instruments, such as sanctions and export/visa controls, stiffened diplomatic dèmarches. But Carter wanted to put military teeth into the international mix by creating a more robust hostage rescue capability, a capability that had some bite and reach, however nascent in its development. The Israelis had demonstrated such a capability in their well-executed and lucky hostage rescue at Entebbe in 1976, and German

border guards were successful in their paramilitary take-down of a skyjacked airliner in Mogadishu, Somalia, in 1977. By the end of the decade, the US would have its own version of this capability.

Carter built upon and modified the Nixon-Ford combating terrorism policy legacy. He placed more emphasis on the political character and "warlike" nature of terrorism, less on its criminality. What started out for Carter as political terrorism—a smorgasbord of sub-national, transnational groups, some with state sponsorship, willing to operate against US and allied interests—ended as "microcosmic" warfare, a teapot war, that scalded the Carter Presidency in the end. Carter lurched from "soft" power instruments to "hard" military power by the end of his Administration. The operational failure of Desert One, the attempted rescue of American hostages in Iran in 1980, demonstrated the effects and consequences of terrorism on US national security interests and the personal CT politics of Presidents. The Carter Administration became consumed with international terrorism during the Iranian Hostage Crisis of 1979-1980. That crisis went a long way toward bringing down the Administration. By 1980, Carter had reversed course and was dealing with terrorism as a problem unto itself. But he played in the Iranian Hostage Crisis end game without fully developed force and policy options. He paid the ultimate political price.

Carter's Special Coordinating Committee for Terrorism

Carter killed Nixon-Ford's CCT concept. His Presidential Review Memorandum 30 called for a review of organization and its capabilities. He wanted to link CT to the White House and the Presidency through the NSC. This key feature would move the President closer to the decision-making process that led to use of force. Linking the CT bureaucracy to the NSC and the White House focused attention and centralized decision-making, policy, operational management, and intelligence in one location near the center of American power. The President was the center of CT strategic decision making, with the NSC linking the terrorism experts to the operators,

intelligence, and policy makers. The NSC was the primary unit for coordination of deliberate policy planning and high-level crisis management.

The positive aspect of this arrangement was that the White House was very much in control of CT and would get full credit for success. The obvious negative was that the President would get full blame for failure. It was a high-risk, White House-dominated organizational structure in a high-risk business. Carter set up a Special Coordinating Committee (SCC), chaired by the NSC Adviser. The Committee consisted of secretaries from State, Defense, the DCI, and the Chairman, JCS. The SCC resolved jurisdictional disputes, assured coordination, and dealt with high-level terrorism crises. The title of the group is important. The term "coordinating" clearly implies "hands-on" management and leadership involvement. Nixon's CCT, on the other hand, implied a more removed oversight function. Nixon's structure may have had too little senior leadership involvement. Carter's structure may have had too much.

In addition, the SCC supervised a Senior Interagency Executive Committee (EC) that handled the routine day-to-day terrorism affairs and dealt with "high-level" CT crisis management. The EC consisted of Assistant Secretaries from State (Chairman), Justice (vice chairman), DoD, Energy, Transportation, Treasury, and representatives from CIA, FBI, the Joint Staff, and the NSC. By 1977, the EC's huge size proved cumbersome. The Assistant Secretary-level was sufficiently high to push difficult issues into the SCC for adjudication. In theory, the combination of the SCC and EC was adequate to deal with most CT issues. Sustaining the power and punch of the committee, however, proved too difficult. This group only tangentially connected to CT operations in the crisis response management structure. This made CT operations twice removed from senior leadership. Senior leadership was somewhat disconnected from operations.

Positioned under the EC was an interagency Terrorism Working Group (TWG) that plugged into the working bureaucracies. It was an all-inclusive sounding board, touching all elements within the terrorism

community. As a debating society of deputy assistant secretaries, colonels, and GS-15s, it could sharpen its terrorism policy. The TWG became too large to be effective.

In 1978, the TWG organized into six standing committees: A Research and Development Committee focused on anti-terrorism research; a Domestic Security Policy Committee looked at maintaining the US border and monitored US domestic vulnerability; a Foreign Security Policy Committee focused on overseas issues; a Contingency Planning and Crisis Management Committee made plans for incident management training; a Public Information Committee; and an International Initiatives Committee that developed multilateral aspects of CT. This reorganization allowed the TWG to focus its deliberate planning on discrete issues.

Lead agencies were responsible for crisis management. Where the incident occurred resolved theoretically the "who's in charge" question. State dealt with terrorism abroad, Justice/FBI with domestic terrorism, and Transportation/FAA with domestic hijackings. State, Justice, and Transportation were Departments headed by Secretaries who had clout by being the President's designated executives. These departments also possessed human and material resources to get things done. Under the Carter CT organization, the Lead Agencies and the SCC managed crises and were supported by the EC and TWG. The DoD was a supporting organization, but it needed NCA authority for action. The President and/or the Defense Secretary were the only authorized persons who could deploy US military forces, not the State and Justice Secretaries. How to get the military into all aspects of coordination, deliberate planning, and crisis response management proved difficult.

The operational planning often came from covert/clandestine military and intelligence operational organizations that were "stovepiped" due to their secrecy and compartmented origins and natures. The "stovepipes" did not interact easily with other elements of CT policy and intelligence. Without the full vetting, head-to-head negotiating necessary to prepare and select options,

the US made mistakes. Military operational failure was separate from policy failure. Goldwater-Nichols would come a decade later, and from Congress, to help fix "joint" operational planning and execution. But stovepipes between special operations forces and conventional forces would remain, even after Goldwater-Nichols. Cultures within cultures, secrecy, "bad blood," and operational entanglements precluded proper operational and policy coordination. Political disaster resulted.

Figure 2. Carter's Special Coordinating Committee Model[8]

SCC (NSC Adviser as Chair + State, DoD, DCI, CJCS--cabinet secretary-level)

EC (Asst. Secretary-level, State Chairs)

Terrorism Working Group (Coordination + Deliberate Planning)

Lead Agencies (Crisis Management)

All three Administrations in the 1970s had experienced a sharp increase in terrorist activity directed against US interests overseas, and focused on how to deal with state-sponsored terrorism. The reason for the increase was that states that sponsored terrorism were providing funding, weaponry, intelligence, sanctuary, international protection and diplomatic cover, and training for proxy terrorist groups, including their own intelligence agents. The US supported democracies that were attempting to deal with terrorists as criminals. Some states sponsored terrorism, and other states had neither the capability nor capacity to deal with groups operating within their borders (Lebanon for example). To deal with this reality, Carter added a military dimension and used force to rescue hostages in Iran. This embryonic military capability came into being in 1977, and by 1980, the State Department's Director for Combating Terrorism had designed a counter-terrorism strategy that used the military for tactical responses and rescues. The FBI also developed a domestic force response capability if negotiations failed.

Despite the clear advances made during the Carter years, many in the terrorism bureaucracy believed major problems persisted in the overall program. From the policy side, different agencies had different responsibilities and viewed the terrorism problem only from their agency's perspective. The Justice Department viewed terrorism as an international criminal activity. The State Department viewed the problem as one of either state-sponsorship, or saw terrorism as a collage of political thugs, some of whom had state sponsors, all as part of a larger diplomatic dispute. State therefore pushed for additional diplomatic resources to resolve the problems. The DoD was reluctant to engage the terrorism issue since it diverted resources from the Soviet conventional and nuclear military threat.

Terrorism continued to have a lesser priority than other regional and functional issues, such as the Middle East peace process, arms control, maintaining alliances, and managing the global Soviet threat. On the operational side, policy makers and military forces involved in combating terrorism were often drawn from other related operational areas. They had neither the experience, nor the necessary training to gain the confidence of their more conventionally minded leadership. Combating terrorism was not a career for most, but an additional duty, a stopping post on the way to more main-stream career jobs.

Counterterrorist operations were always risky. Despite great successes at Entebbe and Mogadishu, other failures had tremendous political down-sides, such as the Egyptian commando failure in Larnaca, Cyprus in 1978, and the US failure at Desert One in 1980. Few of the key operators and policy leaders personally exercised the policy options in a terrorism war game.

While deliberate policy planning continued, crisis response management systems did not function adequately. Few of the top leaders were ever brought into the complex decision-making structures until a live crisis forced their hand. Deputy Assistant-level players were usually the highest-ranking participants in CT war games, simulations, and exercises. A competent, capable, and exercised second-level management structure did not

yet exist in the late 1970s. The CT policy makers "ad hoc-ed" responses during a crisis. These policy makers were not trained in their field. Intelligence remained diversified among the CIA, State, and Defense, and within the bowels of the FBI and Justice Department for domestic terrorism. The right hand still did not talk adequately to the left.

By May 1980, the Carter Administration had developed a full-blown combating terrorism program with elements that addressed the increased international terrorism threat. The program called for adherence to international agreements on terrorism, support for the no concessions policy, security for US facilities abroad, increased response capability for weapons of mass destruction, and improved intelligence and interagency coordination.

Carter saw the terrorism problem tied to other international issues, and not as a threat only to the US. The Middle East problems, the core of which was the Arab-Israel dispute, spawned numerous and unrelenting terrorism campaigns against Israel, the US and the West in general. Rather than focus on terrorism as a discrete issue, the Carter Administration focused on solving the Arab-Israel dispute. He believed solving that chronic sickness would solve the terrorism symptom. Carter proved only partially correct.

The Iran Hostage Crisis and Desert One

In 1979, another Middle East problem arose far to the East of the Levant, the Iran Hostage Crisis. This event overshadowed all else in Carter's combating terrorism program. Carter found that although he did not want the terrorism problem, the terrorist problem wanted him. In 1976, Carter had focused on sub- and transnational terrorism in Latin/South America, Europe, and the Middle East. He had viewed terrorism as crime and a law enforcement issue.

The Iranian Hostage Crisis smashed into his Administration's limited policy and operational options. Iran was a state that sponsored its own terrorism for its own purposes. It was a revolutionary power unto itself, operating independently, the very embodiment of the quote from Clausewitz used in the introduction of this chapter. The US needed a well-honed military option and did not have one. The failed rescue attempt was a benchmark in

the evolution of US CT policy. The flow was simple: the US developed policies and organizations to deal with terrorism. State sponsors took on the US and did not flinch at diplomatic or economic pressures. A military rescue attempt failed while the world watched. The military operational failure helped topple a sitting US President.

The Desert One benchmark showed that state sponsors were real. At the end of the 70s, state-sponsored terrorism became an unambiguous threat to US interests, consumed Carter, and helped bring his Administration down.[9] A role had been created that needed a hero. That hero would be Ronald Reagan.

Reagan: "In your Face CT"

Reagan replaced Carter in dramatic political fashion and dramatically raised the rhetorical level of US CT policy. Reagan saw communists behind each terrorist, and increasingly saw state-sponsorship as the heart of the problem. The declared policy jumped ahead of actual capability. Reagan took on the terrorists early, dealt with the sub- and transnational groups, and increasingly went after state-sponsors. He elevated the priority of terrorism, surrounded himself with like-minded senior leaders and experts, and established an aggressive proactive CT program that included a military power projection capability.

Reagan willingly accepted the CT tools Carter bequeathed him: economic sanctions as a means to punish state sponsors and the hostage rescue capability. But Reagan upped the ante. He said the US would use all appropriate means at its disposal to respond to terrorism abroad. This unambiguous policy placed the military on the front lines, and threatened military actions to respond to terrorist incidents.

While the terrorism rhetoric-levels were high for the incoming President, the deliberate planning system in the government bureaucracy and within the terrorism community lagged behind. The praxis of actual policy limped behind the fire-breathing rhetoric of the declared policy.

With Reagan's terrorism interests and political clout, his Administration's views reshaped US policy. Terrorism became warfare.

Diplomacy, economic sanctions, and military force were the traditional tools of coercion and would be used to cut out terrorism.

By the 1980s, the US and the Western allies had mustered the political will to act forcefully against terrorists. In addition to a "no concessions" policy, the West added two pillars that essentially remain in force today. First, no state that practiced or supported terrorism would do so without consequences. Second, Western states would take action to identify and track terrorists, and bring them to justice.

Getting good intelligence complicated policy implementation. No intelligence is more difficult to collect than CT intelligence. Technical and strategic intelligence collection is important, but individual terrorists do not show up on satellite imagery. "Inside" intelligence gathering is a dangerous, tedious business, perhaps the most difficult in HUMINT operations. In the 1980s, the US and Western countries shared intelligence and began to concentrate on developing special committees devoted to CT and international cooperation. Focusing on the practical aspects of CT, such as border, visa, and travel control, paid off. Several European terrorist groups, such as the Italian Red Brigades, the German Red Army Fraction, the French Direct Action, were defeated and ceased to exist.

Conventional military forces were primary options, but special operations within the military and intelligence "black" world would be used to disrupt, pre-empt, prevent, deter, and respond to terrorist campaigns. Special operations, however, seemed too risky. Reagan picked his targets carefully, choosing Qaddafi and Libya, not Syria and Iran, using conventional forces as primary tools during the Libyan air strikes in 1986 and the Egyptian airliner take-down, and interagency police-military-intelligence forces for the capture of Fawaz Unis.

Reagan set the tone for his Administration's overall response to the increased terrorism campaigns against the US with his campaign promise for swift and effective retribution to punish states that sponsored terrorism. Reagan took on a high combating terrorism profile by using sharp, at times

screeching, rhetoric. The tough talk played well with the American public. Reagan used such barbed quips like "terrorists can run but they can't hide." Whereas Carter learned overtime and through experience to place a high emphasis on state-sponsored terrorism, Reagan came to office ready to act. He saw terrorism as a threat unto itself, sponsored by the Soviets and others who would do the US harm. Reagan would not compromise with them. He placed a high emphasis on state-sponsorship, using the State Department to push the diplomatic buttons to keep terrorists at an arm's length from our borders, and emphasized crisis response management.

By April 1984, Reagan codified his new combating terrorism policy instructions by authorizing direct action missions and pre-emption. Important players in the security decision-making arena agreed terrorism was political violence and state-sponsored terrorism was warfare. Secretary of State George Shultz, NSC Adviser Robert MacFarlane, and CIA Director William Casey shared these basic views with Reagan. They had a convergence of opinion within their respective security organizations. The policy makers agreed on a proactive course of action, but they needed the bureaucracies' forces, operators, and intelligence support to implement it.

Their attention was indeed focused, because the mid-1980s saw the highest levels of international terrorism activity directed at US interests abroad. The terrorism campaigns in 1985-87 exhibited volume, quality, as well as numerous "spectaculars." The gap between declared (rhetorical) priorities and actual priorities embarrassed Reagan several times in the early-mid 1980s. For example, the US appeared helpless when terrorists hijacked TWA 847 and murdered an American sailor.

Reagan had enough. In January 1986, George Bush's Task Force on Combating Terrorism published its findings and set up a comprehensive combating terrorism policy. The recommendations were incorporated into America's national security documents that directed strategic action. The Task Force codified existing policies and structures, and established a small interagency group to oversee non-crisis operations and activities. The small

group brought together the key combating terrorism players from policy, intelligence, and operations in order to exchange information, think through policy and crisis responses, and to prepare their principals for key decisions falling into the terrorism arena. The Task Force also authorized the use of military force and set up a combating terrorism intelligence fusion center at CIA and a National Intelligence Officer on Terrorism. Good ideas that had languished in the terrorism bureaucracy surfaced, were vetted, and if found worthy, incorporated into the deliberate planning and crisis response management structures.[10]

U.S combating terrorism programs appeared to be at the ready to deal with terrorism problems. The Task Force supported use of military force to prevent, deter, pre-empt, disrupt, and respond to terrorism. Leaders were in place, fuming, and primed to act. Terrorism had a sufficiently high priority in the government, leaders had a full assortment of hard and soft power instruments to use, and the military could be used if necessary to go after terrorists and their state-sponsors.

Action finally followed rhetoric and policy planning. US air forces struck Libyan targets in April 1986 following the killing by Libyan intelligence agents of Americans in Germany. The US forced down an Egyptian airliner carrying Abu al-Abbas, the head of a Palestinian terrorist group responsible for the commandeering of the *Achille Lauro* cruise liner and murder of an American citizen. And a CIA-FBI-military sting operation "snatched" the Palestinian terrorist, Fawaz Uniz, in international waters.

Suddenly, the high water mark of US CT proactive policy ended abruptly—Iran-Contra stopped the heady proactive policy in its tracks. But the unintended effects and consequences of Iran-Contra improved US CT capabilities in the long run.

Iran-Contra and Its Effects on US CT Policy and Organizational Structures

Desert One ended the rising tide of U.S CT policy in the 1970s. The Iran-Contra Affair, likewise, stopped Reagan's aggressive proactive measures in

their tracks, turned them over to the bureaucracy, and reversed direction. With the senior executives occupied with the politics of the scandal, second-level executives worked a low-key, in the weeds, police work approach that had very positive, unintended consequences, not expected by the hard liners, and surprising to the moderates in the terrorism bureaucracy.

Iran-Contra placed the CT bureaucracy in a high political profile under the lights of the media. State Department officials and the NSC Legal Counsel began attending terrorism interagency working group meetings as "watchdogs." Many believed Iran-Contra had been run out of the White House. Post Iran-Contra politics diminished the NSC's role in CT. The "cowboys" in the White House were considered "loose cannons" that needed monitoring and to be taken to the wood shed.

Interagency and international coordination became more difficult consequently. Dealing with other countries on issues of international terrorism became more difficult. Other states did not trust US CT policy since the US appeared to violate its own hard line "no concessions" policies, and appeared to trade weapons for hostages. One CT Coordinator believed that when the US strayed from its "no concessions" policy by trading arms for hostages in Iran, terrorists kidnapped more Americans. When the US reaffirmed its long-standing, but often-discarded policy, terrorists eventually freed US hostages.[11]

As a result of Iran-Contra, the US terrorism bureaucracy shifted its emphasis to judicial responses. George Shultz and the State Department took charge. Shultz re-oriented the proactive approach. He placed a trusted manager to run the NSC CT office. Ambassador Robert McNamara replaced the fired Lt. Colonel Oliver North. Shultz's trusted Terrorism Coordinator Jerry Bremer, using State as a power base, refocused the interagency working group on terrorism towards a diplomatic, judicial/legal program. The US retained its no concessions policy, apologized internationally for having deviated from it, and focused on an extraterritorial judicial approach to identify, track, apprehend, and prosecute terrorists wherever found.

Since the terrorism-as-warfare approach had been stopped in its tracks by Iran-Contra, the judicial approach became the front line by default, at least for a while. This raised many issues for the law enforcement community. They had not yet prepared the policy and operational ground work. The Justice Department and FBI were not yet ready to become international policemen. Nor was the international community ready for this action. Unresolved issues surfaced. How could the US enforce its laws overseas? It could not. Extraterritoriality became a hot issue again. How would the State Department deal with FBI "attachès" overseas, and where did State's Regional Security Officers responsibilities end and the FBI agents begin? How would the CIA deal with gathering overseas intelligence and gathering evidence? Intelligence is not equal to evidence in a court of law. As a result of Iran-Contra, the Reagan Administration contributed a non-military approach to combating terrorism, the opposite of what it had intended.[12]

Reagan's Special Situation Group Model

Reagan created, early in his first term, a Special Situation Group (SSG). The Vice President was the chairman of the group, while State, Defense, Director of Central Intelligence, NSC Adviser, Chairman of the JCS, and the President's Counselor were its members. In many ways, the SSG looked and functioned like Carter's SCC, except the Vice President chaired it, and the President's Counselor attended. Despite these changes, the SSG's early experiences were negative.

The kidnapping in Italy of US Brigadier General Dozier by Red Brigade terrorists showed the SSG to be a poor coordinator and integrator of US policy and operations. The "who's in charge?" issue quickly manifested itself. Dozier was a military officer. DoD and the military had a vested emotional interest in an effective resolution of the kidnapping. The Lead Agency concept placed State at the top perch and diplomacy as the primary tool. But State was not part of the national command authorities (President and Defense Secretary) that were needed to authorize the use of military force. The "NCA" problem had to be dealt with in order to use force

overseas. The State Department, as a lead agency and centerpiece for overseas terrorism, had to be connected to the NCA when force options were prepared. The State/DoD squabbling tangled the chain of command.

In 1982, Reagan provided new CT instructions that codified the Lead Agency Concept. Reagan did away with the Executive Committee. He set up an interagency terrorism management organization under the SSG. The Terrorism Standing Group (TSG) was chaired by the NSC, and it included DoD, State, CIA, FBI, and FEMA. The Terrorism Standing Group provided the SSG operational support and interagency coordination during a terrorism incident. The Lead Agencies managed the incident, as in the Carter Administration. This arrangement gave the NCA command and control of military forces.

Beneath the TSG stood the Interdepartmental Group on Terrorism (IG/T). State chaired the IG/T. The IG/T brought together the agencies for deliberate planning and policy development. Lead Agencies still managed the details of terrorism incidents. This overall structure provided operational and policy support to the highest interagency committee, the SSG, that had ultimate responsibility to respond to the terrorism incident. This structure put the White House in the middle of CT, and plugged the President in as much as he wanted to be plugged into CT. This structure solved the NCA problem of using force overseas. Reagan and the Secretary of Defense now had a military response capability and a crisis response management system to manage terrorist incidents.

By April 1984, Reagan's new policy orientation had developed pre-emption as an option. The US would not necessarily stand by to take the terrorist's first blow. Reagan was surrounded by friends who thought like he did. Secretary of State Shultz also saw terrorism as political violence and state sponsored terrorism as warfare. Ambassador Robert Oakley became his Director of CT. Oakley replaced Ambassador Sayre who believed terrorism was a police matter in the main, not a military matter in general. Sayre looked for legal bases of action, not extra-legal.

In addition, Robert MacFarlane, who became Reagan's NSC Adviser near the end of Reagan's first term, also supported a proactive CT policy. CIA Director William Casey provided the intelligence arm and clandestine/covert action capability. The importance of this leadership alignment is striking. The central power authorities in CT were in alignment with the President. Their natural interests in terrorism matched that of the President. Core leadership and national priorities aligned. In addition, a series of terrorism campaigns directed against the US lent urgency for US action.

Bush: Low-key CT

George Bush inherited much of the Reagan Administration's apparatus. He moved quickly to put his own stamp on CT policy and organizations. He found that process easy. Bush was the most educated President on the subject of terrorism. He had lengthy high-level, first-hand experience. Bush had headed Reagan's Terrorism Task Force. He personally endorsed its recommendations, shaped its findings, and was a central figure in institutionalizing them. He did so over the heads of some of the heavy weights in the Reagan Administration that opposed parts of the package. In addition, some elements of the terrorism bureaucracy opposed some of the recommendations because they perceived losing their control and power.

The policy Bush inherited played well in the strategic environment of lessening levels of terrorism. Bush saw terrorism as criminality more than warfare. He retained the "no concessions" policy, continued emphasis on international cooperation, and maintained the extraterritoriality aspects that came to the fore in the latter days of the Reagan Administration. He championed "snatch" operations to bring terrorists and drug dealers to justice. "Snatch" operations were considered for Noreiga prior to "Just Cause," the invasion of Panama, and in Lebanon, to rescue the hostages.

He took a more low-keyed approach, as suggested by his Secretary of State, James Baker. He retained the standing interagency group on terrorism. Bush de-emphasized terrorism during his Administration. Even

during the Desert Shield/Storm operations, he saw the increased threat of terrorism and the hostage taking within Iraq ("human shields") as part of the larger strategic problem of impending war with Iraq. Bush focused on the main battle, the war with Iraq, and dealt with terrorism as a side issue. Bush's NSC adviser, Brent Scowcroft, said terrorism never really came up on the White House radar screen during the Bush Administration except during the release of the hostages in Lebanon. Low-key, sustained diplomatic talks obtained the hostages' release, not military force, or arms-for-hostages swaps. In the post-Cold War era, holding hostages had become a liability for terrorists in Lebanon. Scowcroft, even less interested in terrorism as a strategic threat than Baker, kept terrorism out of the White House.[13]

During his tenure, however, Bush significantly advanced the US government's policy and operational capabilities *if* the government had to deal with terrorism. US policy documents began to display more robust statements concerning terrorism. These documents, such as the National Security Strategy, National Military Strategy, Defense Guidance, and others, used proactive terms such as covert operations to prevent, deter, pre-empt, disrupt, and respond. The action verbs captured the full range of action that a President needed to throttle terrorists, when, and how, he wanted to. Now, operations had to catch up to policy justification. These documents provided the bureaucracy the necessary tools to create policy, operational, and intelligence programs to manage the terrorism problem.

The White House down played the importance of the hostages in Lebanon and allowed a capable terrorism bureaucracy to manage that long-fused, slow burning crisis. Whereas the hostages' families had played an important role in affecting the emotional state of Reagan in the 1980s, and to an extent, Bush, as Vice President, this did not happen again in the early 1990s. Most importantly, US diplomacy very effectively managed international relations during Desert Shield/Storm, including its responses to terrorist threats by Iraqi agents and pro-Iraqi sympathizers worldwide.[14]

While levels of international terrorism increased during the Gulf War, they quickly returned to the much lower post-Cold War levels. Bush had showed terrorists he was not soft on them. He did so by authorizing military and police "snatch" operations. Despite some international backlash, these operations proved popular with the American people and put drug dealers and terrorists on notice they could not escape the long arm of US law. US policy and operations had caught up finally with Reagan's rhetoric that "terrorists can run but they can't hide."[15]

Figure 3. Bush's CT Organization[16]

Principal's Committee

Deputy's Committee

IG/T

Lead Agency

Clinton: "It's the Economy . . . . Oh My! Super- and Homeland Terrorism!

Early on, the Clinton Administration continued to experience fewer incidents of international terrorism. Clinton continued Bush's lower profile strategy. The Clinton Administration, against the advice of some terrorism experts and concerned Congressmen, downgraded the American bureaucracy set up to fight terrorism in the 1980s. Supporters say the lowered terrorism statistics did not warrant maintaining the CT vigilance and infrastructure. But without American leadership in international terrorism, and American leadership to refocus US law enforcement agencies domestically on domestic terrorism, the US would lag behind a reinvigorated terrorism campaign.[17]

Critics of Clinton's CT program might say that he dumbed down, deemphasized, defunded, and deconstructed CT—lowered the CT rank structure, lowered the priority, diverted funds to other priorities, and combined agencies that submerged terrorism as a lesser player among other important issues, like drugs and crime. Indeed, both the State Department and

NSC staffs merged terrorism into "global issue" units. The argument was that a more senior official in charge of a larger, more powerful bureaucracy would have more clout and be able to push better the CT agenda in the strategic circle where the "big boys" played, allocated resources, set priorities, and made decisions. Detractors of this move believed CT had been watered down to the point that an already weakened voice had been lost amongst the other voices in the bureau.

The face of terrorism in the 90s may be changing that reality. Prior to the World Trade Center bombing in February 1993, Justice/FBI and other law enforcement officials had been complacent about major international terrorist incidents in the US, In fact, US domestic terrorism had remained at relatively low levels in the 60s through 80s while other democratic states were used as a terrorist battleground. Both the Bush and Clinton Administrations had weakened America's first line of defense against international terrorism by cutting budgets, losing experts (lack of a viable terrorism career field forced many SMEs to return to other functional careers) and refocusing national attention (it's the economy stupid!).

These actions weakened America's international defenses against terrorism. International cooperation slackened as Western states lost patience with sanctions, and only paid lip service to CT agreements. Local and state law enforcement remained poorly trained and equipped to thwart terrorist activity in the US. The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) was overwhelmed, under equipped, and under trained to handle the border infiltration of terrorists, criminals, and drug traffickers.[18] The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) had become more effective in dealing with natural disasters, but it was not yet equipped to deal with massive casualties and the aftermath of sustained terrorists attacks.

A host of strategic issues then dominated the landscape, and terrorism became a second fiddle issue. Clinton, however, used US conventional forces to retaliate against Iraq when Iraqi agents attempted to assassinate former President Bush during Bush's visit to Kuwait after the Gulf War, and against

Osama bin Laden in Afghanistan and Sudan for his support for bombing U.S embassies in Africa. Cruise missiles and air-delivered precision-guided munitions can be effective retaliation against state sponsors and transnational groups when they can be found and precisely targeted. The use of precision weapons against terrorists is becoming reasonable and practical. Clinton's use of them against Iraq, Afghanistan, and Sudan showed that terrorists can be found and hit with conventional weapons anywhere in the world. Detailed intelligence for targeting and timing are essential prerequisites, but both should improve as technology enhances precision, and international cooperation improves intelligence collection. Clinton's "tomahawk strategy" (using Tomahawk cruise missiles to attack terrorists) is technology and intelligence limited.

Post-Cold War terrorism issues began to manifest themselves and Clinton took them on as policy, operational, and intelligence issues. The "new" terrorism of the 1990s really boiled down to amateur domestic terrorists and new transnational terrorist groups such as Osama bin Laden's, and a heightened WMD threat. Indeed, the Defense Intelligence Agency's assessment placed proliferation of NBC/WMD and other key technologies as the greatest direct threat to US interests worldwide. The major transnational threats to the US were ranked by Defense Intelligence Agency as proliferation of WMD/technology, terrorism, narcotics, and other international crime, in that order.[19] Deputy Defense Secretary Hamre said three hoax anthrax attacks occurred in the US in 1998, and about 100 in 1999.[20] That is disturbing information, reminding one of W. H. Auden's phrase in *Gare du Midi*:

Figure 4. Clinton's CT Structure

Principal's Committee

Deputies Committee

Interdepartmental Group/Terrorism

Lead Agency

"clutching a little case, he walks out briskly to infect a city [w]hose terrible future may have just arrived."

The threat from terrorists having weapons of mass destruction was the first priority while the rise of domestic terrorism and the threat to the US homeland increasingly became a prominent issue. The terrorist profile appeared to be changing according to some terrorism specialists. The new groups appeared to be ad hoc and seemingly autonomous, not connected to established, known groups. Some groups were becoming nationalistic and religious, less political and left wing, willing to engage in higher levels of indiscriminant killing.[21]

What Is To Be Done?

US structure and policy were adequate to combat the relatively low threats from terrorism during the 1960-1990s. Are they adequate to thwart the "new" terrorism of the early 21st century? The "new" terrorism indicates an increase in domestic terrorism that has implications for antiterrorism in the US and potentially dramatic implications for "super" terrrorism and consequence management.

How threatening will the "new" domestic terrorism be in the US and what could the US do about it anyway? The FBI seems adequately prepared to deal with slightly higher levels of domestic terrorism. How many resources to spend to protect US facilities is the larger implication. Oklahoma City experienced a very destructive bombing of a federal building. Protecting all the federal buildings in the US would be very expensive—some say about $350,000 would be necessary to properly and reasonably protect a large complex.[22] The bombing of the Twin Towers complex in New York City is even more problematic. Privately owned property offers an endless target list. Hence, antiterrorism becomes a very expensive proposition in the US Counterterrorism seems more cost effective. No matter how much one protects at the federal, state, local levels, terrorists can always find a "softer" target. US law enforcement can not find all the Timothy McVeigh's in

America. To defend all, one defends nothing. Therefore, it is necessary for the US to focus its resources.

US CT organizations that deal with the "new" terrorism of the 21st century should not start from scratch, but build on what has worked. We also should learn from what has not worked well. New situations in the 21st century will necessitate some original thinking.

Structure: Inter-Connect the NCA-Special Cabinet-level Committee (with Terrorism Support Group), CT Bureaucracies, Lead Agencies and Crisis Response/Consequence Management

"Who's in charge?" was the key issue pertinent to this article. While CT never had a high national security priority, it frequently engaged US Presidents in pop-up crises. Presidents may not have wanted terrorism, but terrorists wanted them.

Any CT organization and program must have adequate links and connections to the NCA (for use of military force). The NCA is the head—it provides the leadership, vision, and direction. The NCA must be connected robustly to a group of Department Secretaries who adjudicate, shape, sort out the high-level key issues, oversee an effective deliberate planning process and CRM. (This group is not situation-based, but a standing group that focuses on CT as a phenomenon, not a crisis point.) The President will get full credit and blame for counter-terrorism actions. The President should be interested and involved in CT. He must lead.

The small Secretaries CT group should be connected to a small group of Assistant Secretary-level specialists that perch atop the CT bureaucracy. A Secretary or a small group of Secretaries must carry the President's torch for him, be his surrogate and impose his will on the government. The Secretary-level group must be small, interested, involved, and meet regularly enough to be effective. Its purpose is to adjudicate and sort out interdepartmental squabbles.

Who adjudicates policy battles among competing Secretaries who are theoretically of equal status is the main problem. Because Secretaries are

chosen by the President—by definition strong willed people, with strong positions, strongly held—some *one* must be able to break ties, separate fights, and make decisions. Neither the Vice President nor a NSC Advisor has proven effective in this role yet. Neither the Vice President nor the NSC Adviser is suited for this role since they command no operational bureaucracy. The President must be engaged and break ties. Leaders lead. The "buck stops here" with the President. He must lead when his secretaries get entangled in the thickets of terrorism.

The Assistant Secretary-level support to the Secretaries' Group is critical. It prepares the Secretaries for important decisions. The support group is the heavy hitter in the CT bureaucracy and pushes the senior leadership's agenda. It imposes the President's and the Secretaries' will. The Assistant Secretary CT Working Group connects to the deliberate planning interagency groups and department groups in the CT bureaucracies down to the departments' CRM organization. NCA must be at the head with senior NSC staffers, department heads in State, DoD, Justice/FBI, CIA, and Transportation, who have real power with people, equipment, funding, and the will to get things done.

The structure must connect from top to bottom, the bottom being the crisis response forces. Feet of clay can topple an iron statue. Desert One was a crisis response operational failure at the low end. It torpedoed Carter's policy. Carter's organization was adequate in structure and policy tools at the high end, but it lacked training, education, equipment, and long-range CT operational experience to pull off the coup de main in Iran.

Can this CT structure deal with higher levels of domestic terrorism and "super" terrorism? I believe the existing domestic CT structures will deal effectively with higher levels of domestic terrorism. US law enforcement has been effective in dealing with the first thirty years of domestic terrorism, and it is equipped to deal with slightly increased levels. The US may be tempted to try to "antiterrorism" everything. The US is an open society and should remain that way. High profile and high value facilities need sound protection,

but the country cannot afford to go overboard. A $350,000 price tag to protect adequately a single building complex from terrorist attack demonstrates the case of the endless black hole. Terrorists simply can go to the next undefended target. It is cheaper to eliminate the terrorists than to try to provide antiterrorism protection to America.

Existing CT structures also are beginning to deal with the consequence management of the aftermath of an NBC WMD attack in the US. What is obviously lacking is the executive branches connecting to the state and local police and emergency response systems. Justice and FBI are working to improve the historically strained relations between federal, state, and local police. The Defense Department must work in that direction also. The National Guard and perhaps the Reserve Component are situated best to deal with these connections. Many in the military and elsewhere will say that funds should be increased to local and state agencies to deal with these problems. In the long run, that may be true. Dealing with the consequences of a NBC WMD attack in the US does, and will continue to, outstrip state and local resources. It outstrips the current resources of the US military, but the US military has the manpower, training, organization, and equipment to begin dealing with consequence management problems on this scale.

I advocate a go slow, deliberate planning process that uses existing resources, rather than throw money and human resources at creating new structures. These type of proposals have gone a bridge too far and spend resources not justified by the existing threat.[23] Deliberate planning? Yes. Some organizational restructuring to deal with consequence management? Yes. But "no" to new government agencies that create and supervise an elaborate federal-state-local empire of fall-out shelters and consequence management units. All of this could be done by an enhanced FEMA and state-local emergencies units, supplemented with National Guard and Reserve Component resources.

DoD as a "Lead Agency"

The DoD currently is not a Lead Agency. It supports other Lead Agencies. The DoD should be in the lead any time force is used. The problem occurs in the handoff from the Lead Agency to the DoD: the State-to-DoD handoff occurs overseas; the Justice-to-DoD handoff occurs in America under very specific circumstances now, but perhaps more expansion will occur in response to super terrorism and homeland defense; the Transportation-to-DoD handoff also occurs in very specific cases. Most of the likely cases admittedly are overseas. The DoD also should know what went on before the terrorist incident, and should be responsible for the consequences of DoD actions after the fact. By placing DoD in a supporting CT role, the US puts its preparation, selection, and execution of a force response option at a disadvantage.

If DoD were actively engaged in the deliberate planning and crisis response management from the beginning, and if DoD allocated the appropriate mix of conventional and unconventional assets from the beginning, then force use and covert/clandestine responses could be executed better. As of now, the only Lead Agency "troops" are FBI agents. Policy and intelligence needs the operators, the "soldiers," to execute force responses. Military operations, conventional and special, need to be coordinated better with CIA's covert/clandestine capabilities.

The operators (FBI, CIA, and the military) currently are removed too far from the deliberate planning phase and not properly integrated into the crisis response structures. The current task force concept addresses the deliberate planning and intelligence functions, but does not adequately combine overt/covert/clandestine operational capabilities. Dovetailing police expertise into this mix further complicates the process, but all are necessary for a seamless operation. DoD/military should be in a lead agency role to coordinate military support of diplomatic and economic sanctions, as well as force option preparation and execution. The DoD/military should consider using both conventional forces and special operations.

Terrorism Czar? Too Far!

In the 1980s, some analysts gave some thought to creating a terrorism czar, an all-powerful person who spoke for the President, consolidated power, and took action against terrorists near and afar. The US has had an Education Czar, and a Drug Czar. Why not a Terrorism Czar? Czars have proven effective in being a proponent for an issue, but Czars have no "troops." Without the dedicated funds, soldiers, police, and intelligence assets that are imbedded in the departments, a Czar cannot conduct a war on terrorism, or anything else. A Czar can be engaged only in a clanging of "symbols" as an advocate.

In the mid-1980s, the Departments mightily opposed the creation of a Terrorism Czar. They did not want to lose their power to an outside agency. Besides, use of military power had clearly defined command and control arrangements. The only legitimate authority that could order the use of military force was the National Command Authority. Likewise, the command and control of law enforcement and police forces in the US is delegated among local, state, and federal police forces. Few of them are specifically trained for domestic counter-terrorism operations. However, the vast majority of past terrorism incidents have been armed assaults, murder, bombings, arson, kidnapping, and hijackings. Police deal with these crimes.

A Terrorism Czar cannot even look good on paper. This idea was a dead letter from the start. Some believe that Lt. Col. Oliver North's position was to be an NSC Terrorism Czar that brought the reins of power into the NSC and White House. In May 1999, Clinton appointed a national coordinator for security, infrastructure protection, and counter-terrorism to "bring the full force of all our resources to bear swiftly and effectively." No harm comes by designating a Czar a White House aide, but one should not put faith in Czars. Real power, as noted earlier, resides in executive departments that have people and resources to get things done, not just talk.

Leadership: Maintain and Sustain Senior Leadership Involvement and Interest in Terrorism

As shown previously, recent US terrorism history exposes the lack of sustained senior leadership involvement, interest, and understanding of the terrorism phenomenon. George Bush was the only sitting President who came to office with first-hand experience in CT. He had headed the Vice President's Task Force on Combating Terrorism and chaired Reagan's SSG for crises. He dealt personally with several of the hostage families during the extended Lebanon CT crises in the mid-1980s. He was the exception. The others learned CT on the job.

In most cases, Presidents gave terrorism a higher rhetorical/declaratory priority than actual national security priority. Leaders "talked the talk but did not walk the walk," calculatedly so. Presidents and cabinet members for the most part did not get involved in a terrorism incident unless it generated a national security crisis. By that time, it was usually reactive, too late except for reprisals or revenge.

Revenge is not a motive that democrats can embrace too long. Carter's Iran Hostage Crisis is the classic case. Reagan personally may have become caught up in the emotions swirling around the hostage families. But that reaction was typical human reaction, and not necessarily a criticism. During the Entebbe crisis, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin likewise got caught up with the emotion of the events. George Bush did also when he dealt with the wife of slain Lt. Col. Higgins over the Christmas holidays in 1986. Criticism is appropriate only when poor national security decisions stem from those meetings. Emotions that produce precipitous action can back fire.

Reagan and members of his cabinet, especially State, CIA, and his NSC adviser, became very involved and set the tone for aggressive CT policy, intelligence, and operations. Often, the policy and response options were inadequately developed and practiced to be efficient and effective. But the President's options for CT policy and operations were adequate, if not plentiful. Reagan had a full complement of options for action, backed up with

policy justification that had the stamp of the CT deliberate planning process. He could do almost anything he wanted overseas operationally—deter, prevent, pre-empt, disrupt, or respond.

Reagan had national assets at his beck and call, but less than full international cooperation. Most Europeans, other than Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, shied away from draconian, forceful measures. They believed the US were cowboys at heart, with a quick trigger finger, too much power to keep holstered.[24]

Reagan did not have the homeland adequately covered—Shultz had convinced him the threat was overseas, not here. Homeland protection would have to wait until the major attacks on US soil in the 1990s during the Clinton years.

Interagency and International Training and Education for Senior Leaders and CT Careerists

US senior leaders just do not "get" terrorism. They do not understand that terrorism is not only criminal violence, but also a new kind of warfare. While senior leaders tend to avoid exercises, war games, and simulations like the plague, they need to be brought into exercises specifically designed to deal with a range of terrorism issues. For example, "super" terrorism-based exercises quickly would teach senior officials that terrorism is only one aspect of that particular crisis. WMD pushes the issue to the NCA whether the NCA wants to deal with it or not.

Little terrorism expertise exists above the Assistant Secretary-level. When crises occur, the understanding of the issue and the complexities of the response quickly transcend real-world experiences of senior leaders. Terrorism decision-making, therefore, is "stovepiped," and stops at the Assistant Secretary level. Education and training on the mechanics of the organizational structure, by way of exercises, would show how the system and policy works, or does not work.

Strong senior leadership and appropriate structures are critical for effective CT policy formulation and implementation. But so are the people

who run the bureaucracies—these people need to be trained and educated in what they do. Career CT specialists—what a concept!

Many in the CT bureaucracy must come together for deliberate planning. Interagency CT training and education would be helpful as a prerequisite to key CT positions. Many policy makers and operators only come together to resolve a terrorism incident during a crisis. Crisis management response training on war games, simulations, and case studies would be helpful before managing an actual event. A crisis situation is not the place to learn the nature of the terrorism business. Terrorism Task Force training exercises, similar to the joint task force training performed for policy makers and operators at the Armed Forces Staff College in Norfolk, could be developed and made mandatory for those preparing to enter the CT bureaucracy.

Terrorism education would further enhance the understanding of the broad issues of terrorism and how the terrorism phenomenon links to the larger strategic environment. Terrorism studies, and other "military operations other than war" subjects, should be part of the curriculum in government educational and training institutions. Senior professional military education now treats terrorism as an "elective." CT specialists must be educated to think strategically and to understand strategic crime, like terrorism.

Many argue the CT community is far ahead of other functional areas (such are drug trafficking and international crime) in interagency and international cooperation. Their argument is persuasive; however, much is yet to be done. Substantial progress has been made over the three decades. A terrorism career field exists, of a sort. Those who are in it enjoy it. This career path does not, however, lead to the more senior positions within the departments. Many terrorism experts still transfer in from other fields. Terrorism has been a tertiary responsibility in many, if not most, departments. Personnel are added-on when terrorism is hot, then removed when the terrorism light switch is turned off.

Functional terrorism expertise and power tend to stay within the terrorism "stovepipe" community. Terrorism often does not transfer well into other functional/regional areas. Terrorism as a field is still quite new. Terrorism experts often are not promoted outside their career fields. US leadership, at all levels, needs training and education, war games, and crisis decision exercises on terrorism.

Prepare for Strategic Crime. Think about an Alternative Organizational Structure—"Office of Strategic Services"

Strategic crime is the combined lawlessness of organized crime, drug trafficking, and terrorism of a quantity and quality that threatens a range of security interests of a state. Clear and present dangers stem from organized crime, drug trafficking, terrorism, and low-intensity conflict. These "non-traditional" security dangers will threaten the US and its allies more than the real or imagined dangers of conventional, interstate war. Russia, Colombia, and many of the states in the former Soviet Union are examples of states affected by strategic crime. These are friends and strategic partners of the US. Their well-being affects US interests.

Physical violence and intimidation against people and illegal appropriation of property undermine the political, economic, social, and psychological well-being of a state. Strategic crime attacks the state's rule of law and legitimate power. Market democracy consists of rule of the people through their elected officials, and the citizens' use of a free market to produce and sell goods. Strategic crime attacks market democracy by creating a perverse, parallel economy and loss of citizens' confidence in government. If people believe the state cannot or will not provide security from strategic crime, strategic crime can undermine the foundations of market democracy. Strategic crime kills and intimidates people, takes their property, and corrupts, perverts, and distorts democratic institutions and the free market. Strategic crime destroys the social contract between citizens and the state. Strategic crime is a threat to important interests of some of America's friends and

strategic partners and some of the emerging democracies around the world. Strategic crime, therefore, is an important interest of the US.[25]

Strategic crime is the cumulative effect of criminal violence and terrorism that can have strategic consequences. Bureaucratically, it would involve domestic and overseas agencies, criminal and national security agencies, law enforcement and military. Strategic crime occurs domestically and overseas, but it involves both law enforcement and the military. Strategic crime is departmental, interagency, and international.

Today, different US security systems deal independently with organized crime, drug trafficking, and terrorism. Combining these functions would focus attention, centralize, streamline, and provide synergy. The World War II Office of Strategic Services (OSS) model, updated to 21st century democratic standards, is a model that would work. A Terrorism OSS would be an office built upon existing departments and functions, combining law enforcement and military, CIA, DIA, State INR, FBI intelligence, and existing policy organizations in State, DOJ, NSC, DoD, DEA, etc., for policy. The organization would straddle existing units, bring necessary expertise together, draw upon the vast public domain services available, and operate to thwart strategic crime.

The idea for a Terrorism OSS, a separate, "purple" service that combines intelligence and operations and works under strict policy guidance of the NCA sounds intriguing. It solves the centralized authority problem and connects to the NCA. Focus of effort, centralization of planning, and CRM are contained in one tight organization. While the OSS worked well in World War II, trying this on for size in an America that already questions "black" operations in the CIA may be a bridge too far. America may not tolerate another narrowly focused covert organization with guns. There would be internal bureaucratic obstacles as well, not just spiritual and ethical. The military Services already view Special Operations as a Fifth Service. Another Service would seem to clutter an already cluttered table of players.

CT Priority: Keep CT Low-key

US Presidents have gotten US CT priority about right. In general, US CT has a relatively low national security priority. Thus far, terrorism has been primarily a nuisance, not a serious national threat. Terrorism priority has fluctuated. Like terrorism itself, terrorism's priority has been like a light switch. Presidents gave CT a high priority during an incident, then almost forgot about it during a lull. Reagan had the most proactive CT policy and sustained a counter-terrorism track record. Bush had arguably the most low-key, methodical approach.

The US has not set a high priority for terrorism, but has been able to sustain action against individuals, sub- and transnational groups, and especially state sponsors. State sponsors in many ways are easier for the US to target because a state has people, territory, and resources in a set boundary. Targeting sponsors may be the key. Individuals and sub- and transnational groups are more elusive, more difficult to grab hold, and more difficult to target. Does the "new" terrorism, increased domestic terrorism or "super" terrorism, dramatically affect CT's low priority?

Prepare for High-Technology NBC Terrorism Quietly and Effectively, but Focus on Low-Technology Terrorism

Super terrorism has been a threat to the US for some time. Terrorists seldom have used nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. There may be no "Dr. No" now, but when? The issue is not *if*, but *when* a NBC attack occurs in America. The US can sustain a terrorist attack that inflicts high casualties, but a mass casualties attack threatens strategic interests, perhaps vital interests. If conservative estimates are wrong that terrorism will not take a radical turn toward super terrorism, the consequences are too great a risk for America to take.[26] CT organization needs to be responsive to the threat.

Super terrorism, indeed, appears to be beyond the CT bureaucracies' current capabilities. Super terrorism is a major strategic issue requiring the full attention of the NCA and agencies beyond the CT bureaucracy. That fact has been demonstrated in numerous exercises and games designed for

terrorism experts to play. This training has exposed the need to quickly elevate the crisis to the NCA for action and resolution. Currently, no government agency exists to cope with the full magnitude of the repercussions of such a NBC high-tech attack, including its psychological and physical costs. Tacit agreements between Western governments and state sponsors of terrorism assume state sponsors will restrain their attacks to nuisance attacks, not strategic attacks. If terrorist attacks go strategic, such as the World Trade Center bombing could have been, then the US likely would respond strategically. Some day, a new radical state may decide to launch such an attack by using WMD however built and delivered to American soil. As noted earlier in this paper, over 100 anthrax hoaxes occurred in the US in 1999. Further, the links with international drug traffickers and organized crime provide a global network that can move money and information, fashion technology creatively, transport black market commodities, and avoid discovery by an overwhelmed police system. America can be proud of the quiet and effective ways its CT bureaucracy has planned and coordinated consequence management and disease control measures. These federal networks touch state and local emergency groups that deal with the problem at the site of the incident.

For example, the 1999 US National Security Strategy document, like several of its earlier predecessors, gives high priority to "super" terrorism and WMD in general. Terrorism experts now are suggesting the creation of a large organization to deal with "catastrophic" terrorism. They are putting organizational flesh to the nuclear arguments Dr. Robert Kupperman peddled for years. Their thesis is that a WMD attack on the US is now more likely than at any time in the past. America is prepared for "conventional" terrorism, but not super terrorism with NBC WMD attacks. They posit a focused approach on homeland defense and a massive organizational restructuring to deal with super terrorism and its potentially catastrophic consequences.

Their superstructure for super terrorism is overblown. The superstructure they envision is predicated on an imagined threat, not a

demonstrated terrorist capability. They also have under-estimated greatly capabilities that already exist in FEMA, the US military, the Reserve Component and National Guard, and federal, state, and local law enforcement and emergency agencies. The homeland defense issue, with its emphasis on anti-terrorism, will deal with a major part super terrorism and consequence management.

Most terrorists use low technology. Likewise, many government responses use low technology. These methods of operations will continue. The terrorism that is predicted to occur in the emerging democracies will replicate what happened in the West in the 1960s and 1970s. Terrorists in emerging democracies likely will use the same weapons, tactics, and targets that worked against Western democracies. "Amateur" terrorism will be a nuisance to our friends just like it was a nuisance, but not a strategic threat, to the US.[27] The picture of terrorism in the West in the 1960s and 70s will be visited upon the emerging market democracies early in the 21st century.

The West and the US should help those democracies that seek help to deal with a terrorism problem on their turf that is sure to come. Some of these countries will be open to Western help. Helping them will help the US and the West. Training, education, police, and military assistance are necessary on a large scale. The CT bureaucracies should place the proper weight on helping others deal with their terrorism problem in the region, before that regional terrorism affects US interests. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

A beefed up FBI should be able to handle the projected increase in domestic terrorism. America may have dozens of Tim McVeighs. The federal-state-local police cannot prevent all those who would do America ill, but they can do a credible job while maintaining America values.

Recruit More HUMINT and Language Experts

The US has fantastic SIGINT (technology) capabilities that contribute mightily to effective CT. But in the 21st century, US intelligence must broaden and deepen considerably. America's traditional national security focus on old

enemies created a narrow intelligence expertise that we now must transcend. The US needs allies in the emerging democracies that were in the intelligence darkness only a few years before. Human intelligence, regional expertise, and language capabilities are essential for future CT operations. Satellites cannot track individual terrorists. Human sources are needed to penetrate terrorist organizations. Good intelligence is crucial to CT operations. The kind of tactical intelligence CT needs is derived from HUMINT. The US has many German, French, Russian speakers, etc., and regional experts. America needs to develop similar expertise in the emerging democracies, becoming knowledgeable of their politics and their languages. This infrastructure may be very costly, but is a fungible capability with interagency reach.

Think about instituting international "finger" squads. A finger squad is a group of policemen, military special operations, clandestine/covert intelligence operators whose mission is to track and identify terrorists. At the appropriate time, the finger squad turns the fugitives over to local authorities for apprehension and arrest. European police used this method during the hey-days of European terrorism. This method was effective, but politically risky. In a way, the Clinton Administration already used this approach with ad hoc specialized task forces. For example, the interagency Osama bin Laden task force collects data, monitors, and tracks his groups. This task force essentially focuses on intelligence, but could be combined with an operational component. Putting an operational point on this concept is needed.

---

[1] See the State Department's *Patterns of Global Terrorism, 1997,* April 1998, *passim.*

[2] See Brian Jenkins' "International Terrorism: A New Mode of Conflict," Research Paper No. 48, Crescent Publications, Los Angeles, California, 1974.

[3] Vice President Bush's Task Force found that over 150 US agencies dealt with some aspect of terrorism in 1985, consuming over 18,000 man-years of time.

[4] See David Tucker, *Skirmishes at the Edge of Empire: The United States and International Terrorism* (Praeger: Westport, CT, 1997), especially his chapter

on "History" (pp. 1-50) that covers six American administrations from Nixon to Clinton. I have borrowed heavily from his discussion.

[5] Combating terrorism is comprised of counterterrorism, offensive measures against terrorists such as reprisal raids, plus antiterrorism, defensive measures for force protection.

[6] The Nixon-Ford value-added inputs to combating terrorism policies are:

- The terrorist threat comes from sub- and transnational groups; some groups had state sponsorship
- Terrorism is a crime
- A declared "no concessions" policy—a democratic state does not deal with criminals (mixed application and enforcement undermined credibility of the policy)
- Terrorism is part of a larger political problem (sub- and transnational issues stemming from regional political problems in Latin/South America, Western Europe, the Middle East)
- Terrorism not a major domestic threat
- Terrorism is largely an international issue for the US, and an overseas problem; therefore, the State Department uses diplomacy, dèmarches, international agreements/organizations as primary tools to combat it; increase anti-terrorism protection of US facilities abroad
- Economic sanctions/export/visa controls to punish states that support terrorism
- Only embryonic military rescue/reprisal capabilities available
- Traditional timing/sequence for responses: diplomatic, economic, rescue, military response
- A reactive policy, not a proactive program

[7] The following pros and cons are relevant to the Nixon-Ford CT cabinet model: terrorism low priority; low-level cabinet interest; no real "champion" of terrorism; head disconnected; state department-focused and dominated; CCT Working Group somewhat effective, but the real hammer with the departments; crisis response management system not plugged in; operations-policy-intelligence "stovepipes;" no CT training or education; no real CT careerists.

[8] The following pros and cons are relevant to the Carter CT model: White House/NSC connected—prime focus (President/NSC Adviser); SCC adjudicated interagency disputes, established jurisdictions, high-level crisis management; lack of real cabinet-level interest until Iran Hostage Crisis; deliberate planning not adequately plugged into crisis response management (a potential disconnect between policy and option preparation and option selection/execution); EC responsible for day-to-day high level management;

TWG responsible for deliberate planning, and a sounding board for new ideas; DoD and military connection too loose.

[9] Carter's added-value inputs to combating terrorism policies are:

- Elevated terrorism interest/priority to the White House
- Linked decision-makers, planners, and crisis response management to the NSC and President
- Initially viewed terrorism as part of a larger political problem; forced to deal with terrorism as a problem unto itself
- Developed a hostage rescue capability and military force options

[10] The Task Force considered setting up a "Czar" for terrorism, a position with interagency policy, intelligence, and operational power. The Departments opposed the concept; they lost their power to the Czar and the NSC. The compromise was to increase the power of the NSC position responsible for terrorism. Lt. Colonel Oliver North, who was running several portfolios in the NSC, including terrorism, became that informal "czar." He took the position seriously.

[11] See L. Paul Bremer's article, "Seizing the Initiative: The US Role in Combating Terrorism," *Harvard International Review* (Summer, 1995): 42.

[12] Reagan's added-value input to combating terrorism policies are:

- Terrorism has a high declared priority; terrorism seen as a weapon of state, surrogate war
- State sponsors and international terrorism recognized as a threat to the US
- President and several senior executives have high interest in terrorism; some deal directly with families of hostages
- Counterterrorism developed—Force use as an option overseas; go after state sponsors and terrorists with military force
- High rhetoric levels
- High White House/NSC profile
- Senior executives give terrorism extra support and are active players in the business: Secretary of State, Director CIA, NSC Advisor
- Vice President's Terrorism Task Force codified policies, program, laws

[13] Interviews with Bush and Scowcroft in 1994 for OASD(SO/LIC)'s long-term terrorism policy study.

[14] My personal observations as Vice President's Bush's Military Assistant, 1984-1989.

[15] Bush's added-value inputs to terrorism policy are:

- Reduced rhetoric, took a low-key approach
- Quiet, behind the scenes diplomacy
- Stressed international cooperation
- The right of extraterritoriality and long-arm of the law "snatch" operations using military/police forces
- Terrorism viewed as criminal and part of a larger political problem

[16] The following factors affected Bush's CT organization: inherited a counterterrorist program based on his VPTF recommendations; retained Reagan's robust policy instruments and operational capability, including retaliation and extraterritoriality; authorized "snatch" operations, without host governments' consent; low-keyed CT approach; fewer terrorism incidents; de-emphasized CT—downgraded State's CT head from Ambassador-at-Large to Coordinator; emphasized international cooperation—effective during Gulf War against Iraq and its terrorist sympathizers

[17] See L. Paul Bremer, "Seizing the Initiative: The US Role in Combating Terrorism," *Harvard International Review* (Summer 1995): 40.

[18] Indeed, VP Bush headed up a task force to look into ways to fix that problem in 1988. The report was lost in the bureaucracy during the transition and was never implemented.

[19] See DIA's *Global Threats and Challenges: The Decades Ahead,* statement for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, January 28, 1998, 7.

[20] Deputy Defense Secretary Hamre provided this information in a speech at the Omni Sheraton Hotel in Washington D.C., July 20, 1999.

[21] Clinton's added-value inputs to terrorism policy are:

- Focus on super terrorism and weapons of mass destruction
- Focus on homeland defense and domestic terrorism
- Use of conventional, cruise missiles
- Organized terrorism within "global" issues departments at State and the NSC
- Dealing with overlapping multifunctional issues—technology proliferation, WMD, strategic crime and terrorism
- Using task forces on discrete groups to monitor, track, and respond

[22] General Wayne Downing presentation at the INSS terrorism conference, 20 July 1999, National Defense University.

[23] See Ashton Carter, John Deutch, and Philip Zelikow, "Combating Catastrophic Terrorism," *Foreign Aff*airs (November/December 1998): 80-94.

[24] Views expressed at international fora at the NATO Defence College, Rome, Italy, 1989, and at Harvard's Center for International Affairs, 1993.

[25] See Douglas Menarchik, "Strategic Crime and Romanian National Security Strategy: Dealing with "Non-traditional" Security Threats—Organized Crime, Drug Trafficking and Terrorism in East and Central Europe," a paper delivered at Bucharest, Romania to a NATO-sponsored conference on Romanian national security, March 1997.

[26] See Robert Kupperman, "A Dangerous Future: The Destructive Potential of Criminal Arsenals," *Harvard International Review* (Summer 1995): 47.

[27] See Kupperman, "A Dangerous Future," 80.